UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,842	03/30/2004	Jonathan J. Hull	20412-08351	6494

76137 7590 05/22/2009

RICOH/FENWICK
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER	
MCLEAN, NEIL R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/22/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOC@FENWICK.COM
gsueoka@fenwick.com
nmorad@fenwick.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/814,842	HULL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Neil R. McLean	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 April 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *63-101* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *63-101* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4/16/2009*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Claims 63-101 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 63-101 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code (Paragraph [0029]). Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 63, 65 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobori et al. (US 4,703,366) hereinafter 'Kobori' in view of Korman et al. (US 6,308,887) hereinafter 'Korman'.

Regarding Claim 63: (Previously Presented)

Kobori discloses a printer for printing time-based media (Figure 1) comprising:

a chassis for housing (Chassis 52 for Housing 50 of Figure 15);

a print engine for generating a printout of a storage representation and controlling printing to a plurality of storage media forms (e.g., Printing Mechanism 55 driven by a motor system; Column 13; lines 1-4), including removable storage media forms (e.g., Magnetic Disk 8 of Figure 1), the print engine being coupled to media holders (The portion of Disk Motor 7 which supports or holds the Magnetic Disk 8) and an output module (e.g., Video Output of Figure 2);

a monitoring module for monitoring streaming media content from a time-based media source input (e.g., Video Monitor 25 and Monitor Switch 24 of Figure 2);

selecting a portion of the monitored streaming media content based on a plurality of user defined criteria and for interfacing with interfaces for multiple types of media content (e.g., "freeze" command at Input Terminal 20 and Recording Command Generating Section 23 of Figures 2 and 3);

a content indexing module communicatively coupled to the embedded multimedia server for indexing the selected portion of the streaming media content (Kobori discloses a disk having a 'plurality of tracks' after the image is stored; Column 8, lines 46-48. The Examiner perceives the Applicant's "content indexing module" to be equivalent to Kobori's 'pointing to a segment of the media'

to indicate for example, the beginning of each track within the sector. The placing of such 'address marks/pointers' are well known in the art); and

the output module for constructing the storable representation of the selected portion of the streaming media content (e.g., reproduced video signal is sent to printer; Column 5, line 67 – Column 6, line 5).

Kobori does not disclose expressly an embedded multimedia server.

Korman discloses an embedded multimedia server (10 in Figure 2; Column 3, lines 48-56).

Kobori & Korman are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing, e.g., both references disclose the control and processing of time-based media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a multimedia server in the overall media processing system as taught by Korman. The suggestion/motivation for doing so is to provide a control and communication relay for the multi-media processing devices comprising the media processing system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kobori with Korman to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 1 to maximize convenience for the user.

6. Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobori and Korman as applied to Claim 63 above, and further in view of Reese et al. (US 7,298,512) hereinafter 'Reese'.

Regarding Claim 64: (Previously Presented)

Korman further discloses the printer of claim 63, further comprising:

a network interface communicatively coupled to the embedded multimedia server for receiving a document in a print job (Figure 1);

Kobori & Korman do not expressly disclose a content processing module for extracting a Uniform Resource Locator from the document; a content processing module for extracting a Uniform Resource Locator from the document; the output module constructing a printable web content representation of the retrieved content web page; an embedded printer display for a thumbnail image associated with the web content printable representation constructed by the embedded multimedia server; the print engine for making the web content printable representation available for printing to a selected printable medium responsive to the image being selected in the embedded printer display.

Reese discloses a content processing module for extracting a Uniform Resource Locator from the document (e.g., The JAVA technologies disclosed at Column 1, lines 46-54); and a web server for retrieving a content web page identified by the Uniform Resource Locator referenced in the document (e.g., The embedded web server enables the printer to provide a web page; Column 4, lines 11-14); the output module constructing a printable web content representation of the retrieved content web page (e.g., a JAVA application previously disclosed displays a web page to the user); an embedded printer display (e.g., the printer/multi-function device through a display and control panel on the device; Column 5, lines 13-15) for a thumbnail image associated with the web content printable representation constructed by the embedded multimedia server (The embedded web server provides a web page that allows the user to interact; Column 4,

lines 11-14; It is well known in the art that web browsers and web pages can display thumbnail images relating to internet/web content); and the print engine for making the web content printable representation available for printing to a selected printable medium responsive to the image being selected in the embedded printer display (e.g., a JAVA application previously disclosed is instructed by user to print a web page).

Kobori in view of Korman is analogous art with respect to Reese since they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing; e.g., all three references disclose printing and imaging systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill int he art to disclose a content processing module for extracting a Uniform Resource Locator from the document; a content processing module for extracting a Uniform Resource Locator from the document; the output module constructing a printable web content representation of the retrieved content web page; an embedded printer display for a thumbnail image associated with the web content printable representation constructed by the embedded multimedia server; the print engine for making the web content printable representation available for printing to a selected printable medium responsive to the image being selected in the embedded printer display. The suggestion/motivation for doing so is to allow user's to access a URL from e.g., an internet site and to print out the associated web page. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kobori in view of Korman and Reese to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 64 in order to allow users to interact with the printer in order to control and/or provide information.

Regarding Claim 65: (Previously Presented)

Kobori further discloses the printer of claim 63, wherein the print engine further comprises a removable storage medium format writer for electronic storage mediums (Magnetic Disk 8).

7. Claim 66 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobori & Korman in view of Reese as applied to claim 65 above, and further in view of Hymel.

Regarding Claim 66: (Previously Presented)

Kobori & Korman in view of Reese do not expressly disclose wherein the medium format writer is a digital video disc.

Hymel further discloses wherein the medium format writer is a digital video disc (DVD Player described in [0010]).

Kobori & Korman in view of Reese is analogous art with respect to Hymel because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use at the interface a DVD drive. The suggestion for doing so would have been that DVD's are a common form of video data media. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with Kobori & Korman in view of Reese to obtain the invention as specified.

Regarding Claim 67: (Previously Presented)

Hymel further discloses the printer of claim 63, wherein the print engine further comprises a removable storage medium format writer for optical storage mediums (DVD Player described in [0010]).

8. Claim 68 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobori, Korman and Reese as applied to claim 63 above, and further in view of Morinaga (US 4,734,898).

Regarding Claim 68: (Previously Presented)

Kobori in view of Korman do not disclose expressly that one of the media holders is a bandolier configured for holding a removable storage medium.

Morinaga discloses a bandolier type handling mechanism (Figure 3a; Column 4, lines 53-62)

Kobori and Korman are analogous art with respect to Morinaga because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely processing and storing digital output data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the bandolier type handling mechanism taught by Morinaga as another type of handling mechanism from which to choose. The motivation for doing so is to store even more removable storage devices while preventing damage to the removable storage devices as disclosed by Morinaga in the Summary of Invention. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Morinaga with Kobori and Korman to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 68 to prevent damage to the recorded surface of the selected disc.

9. Claims 69 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobori and Korman as applied to claim 63 above, and further in view of Katsuo et al. (US 5,721,883) hereinafter 'Katsuo'.

Regarding Claim 69: (Previously Presented)

Kobori and Korman disclose the printer of Claim 63, but do not expressly disclose wherein the streaming media content from the time-based media source comprises multi-channel streaming media content.

Katsuo discloses performing parallel processing of image data (Figure 1; Column 3, lines 30-49). Kobori in view of Korman is analogous art with respect to Katsuo since they are form the same field of endeavor, namely the processing of digital image data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform processing of the received video image data in parallel. (Note: The Examiner perceives the Applicant's 'multi channel' to be the equivalent to Katsuo's 'parallel processing'). The suggestion/motivation for doing so is to increase the speed with which a user can obtain processed image data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Katsuo with Kobori in view of Korman to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 69 in order to process the data faster.

10. Claims 70 and 71 and 72 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kibori and Korman as applied to claim 63 above, and further in view of Krumm (US 6,611,622).

Regarding Claim 70: (Previously Presented)

Kibori and Korman disclose the printer of claim 63, but do not expressly disclose further comprising a content editing module for automatically segmenting the streaming media content into a plurality of media clips based on an event in an audio channel associated with the streaming media.

Krumm discloses a content editing module for automatically segmenting the streaming media content into a plurality of media clips based on an event in an audio channel associated with the streaming media (Column 8, lines 28-33).

Krumm is analogous art with Kibori and Korman because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the processing and output of image data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to not only capture content, as taught by Kobori and Korman, but to recognize content within the image data, as taught by Krumm. The suggestion/motivation for doing so is to allow the user to select a particularly desirable content automatically rather than having the user perform the recognition and capture manually, which is much slower and considerably more tedious for the user. Thus, the system of Kobori and Korman would be improved by incorporating content recognition as taught by Krumm. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

combine Krumm with Kibori and Korman to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 70 to aid the user select particular image content.

Regarding Claim 71: (Previously Presented)

Kobori and Korman disclose the printer of claim 63. The Examiner respectfully believes that it is inherent that a printer can print a bar code which corresponds to digital data on a removable storage medium, including generating a bar code to identify the selected portion of the streaming media content in the removable storage medium.

Regarding Claim 72: (Previously Presented)

Kobori in view of Korman disclose the printer of claim 63 including a print engine generating a printout of the storable media clip representation but but do not expressly disclose a user interface module for receiving user input to the printer indicating a participant speaker of a recorded video meeting; the embedded multimedia server further comprising: a content recognition module for performing multimedia content recognition on the streaming media content to determine one or more speakers in the recorded video meeting; a content editing module for segmenting the streaming media content into a plurality of media clips based on which of the one or more speakers is speaking in the recorded video meeting; and a content selection module for selecting a media clip from the plurality of media clips as the portion of the monitored streaming content, the user defined criteria comprising a time period when the participant speaker is the one or more speakers speaking in the recorded video meeting; the content

indexing module indexing the plurality of media clips by the one or more speakers in the recorded video meeting;

the output module constructing a storable media clip representation for the selected media clip.

Krumm discloses a user interface module for receiving user input to the printer indicating a participant speaker of a recorded video meeting (200 of Figure 2);

the embedded multimedia server further comprising:

a content recognition module for performing multimedia content recognition on the streaming media content to determine one or more speakers in the recorded video meeting (204 of Figure 2);

a content editing module for segmenting the streaming media content into a plurality of media clips based on which of the one or more speakers is speaking in the recorded video meeting (206 of Figure 2); and

a content selection module for selecting a media clip from the plurality of media clips as the portion of the monitored streaming content, the user defined criteria comprising a time period when the participant speaker is the one or more speakers speaking in the recorded video meeting (206 of Figure 2);

the content indexing module indexing the plurality of media clips by the one or more speakers in the recorded video meeting (208 of Figure 2);

the output module constructing a storable media clip representation for the selected media clip (Store the Histogram of an Extracted region; 208 of Figure 2).

Kobori in view of Korman is analogous art with respect to Krumm because they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing, e.g., the control and processing of time-based media. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a system that can identify people an objects in an image of a scene. The suggestion/motivation for doing so is to identify the people in e.g., a meeting or conference. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Krumm with Kobori and Korman to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 72 in order to determine the participants in a meeting.

11. Claims 73-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobori, Korman & Krumm as applied to claim 72 above, and further in view of Chino (US 6,118,888).

Regarding Claim 73: (Previously Presented)

Kobori and Korman in view of Krumm disclose the printer of claim 72 but do not expressly disclose wherein the content recognition module applies a speech recognition method to determine an identity of the one or more speakers in the recorded video meeting.

Chino discloses wherein the content recognition module applies a speech recognition method to determine an identity of the one or more speakers in the recorded video meeting (Figure 1)

Kobori and Korman in view of Krumm is analogous art with respect to Chino because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control and processing of time-based media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the embedded audio sound localization module taught by Chino as part of the overall multimedia processing system. The motivation for doing so is to ensure that user input is intended, and the user is not speaking to someone else (Column 1, lines 52-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chino with Kobori and Korman in view of Krumm to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 73.

Regarding Claim 74: (Previously Presented)

Chino further discloses the printer of claim 72, wherein the content recognition module applies a face recognition method to identify a visual appearance of the one or more speakers in the recorded video meeting (101 of Figure 1).

Regarding Claim 75: (Previously Presented)

Chino further discloses the printer of claim 72,wherein the content recognition module applies a voice matching method to identify a voice of the one or more speakers in the recorded video meeting (STEP A12).

Regarding Claim 76: (Previously Presented)

Chino further discloses the printer of claim 72, wherein

the user interface module receives a user input indicating a location of the participant speaker (101 of Figure 1; Gaze Object Detection Section);

the content editing module segments the streaming media content into the plurality of media clips based on locations associated with the one or more speakers in the recorded video meeting (Control Section 107); and

the content selection module selects the media clip illustrating a time period when the location associated with the one or more speakers in the recorded video meeting is the location of the participant speaker (Control Section 107).

Regarding Claim 77: (Previously Presented)

Chino further discloses the printer of claim 72, wherein the content recognition module applies a sound localization method to determine the locations associated with the one or more speakers in the recorded video meeting (102 of Figure 1).

Regarding Claims 78-95:

The proposed combination of Kobori, Korman, Reese, Hymel, Morinoga, Katsuo, Krumm and Chino explained in the rejection of apparatus claims 63-77, renders obvious the steps of the method of claims 78-95 because these steps occur in the operation of the proposed combination as discussed above. Thus, the arguments similar to that presented above for claims 63-77 are equally applicable to claims 78-95.

Regarding Claims 96-101:

The proposed combination of Kobori, Korman, Reese, Hymel, Morinoga, Katsuo, Krumm and Chino explained in the rejection of apparatus claims 63-77 and method claims 78-95, renders obvious the steps of the Computer Program Product of claims 96-101 because these steps occur in the operation of the proposed combination as discussed above. Thus, the arguments similar to that presented above for claims 63-77 and 78-95 are equally applicable to claims 96-101.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Sugiyama et al. (US 5,633,723) discloses a video printer.

Examiner Notes

13. The Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully considers the references in its entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or as disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neil R. McLean whose telephone number is (571)270-

1679. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30AM-4:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on 571.272.7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Neil R. McLean/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625